DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 498 SO 008 899

AUTHOR Taylor, Harold
TITLE A University for the World: The United Nations Plan. Fastback 51.
INSTITUTION Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Ind.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 51p.
AVAILABLE FROM Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 8th and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, Indiana 47401 ($0.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Books; Developed Nations; Developing Nations; Futures (of Society); *Global Approach; Higher Education; Human Services; *International Education; International Programs; Secondary Education; Social Change; Social Factors; Social Influences; Social Problems; Student Volunteers; *World Affairs; *World Problems; *Youth
IDENTIFIERS *United Nations University

ABSTRACT

This booklet discusses how the United Nations University, established in 1973, can bring youth together on a world scale and create an international system through which youth can join in the work of building a world community. The first chapter, A University for the World: The United Nations Plan, describes student protests in Thailand in 1973. Other chapter titles include: Youth as a Social Force, World Unity and the International Student Movement, The Organization of Internationalism, The World Youth Assembly, The United Nations University, A University without Students, Some Possibilities for Action, The Contribution of the World Community, Youth Volunteers in the Human Services, and The Creation of a Planetary Ethnic. (Author/RM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

A UNIVERSITY FOR THE WORLD: THE UNITED NATIONS PLAN

Harold Taylor

ED 118498

ASTBACK
51

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTIT. OF
EDUCATION

CE 008 899

Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation

HAROLD TAYLOR

Before assuming the presidency of Sarah Lawrence College in 1945, Harold Taylor taught philosophy for six years at the University of Wisconsin. During the fourteen years of his presidency he worked with students and faculty in experimental programs in student democracy, curriculum reform, the creative arts, social change, and world affairs.

In 1963, Dr. Taylor directed a pilot project for a world college in collaboration with members of the United Nations secretariat and delegations, with an international student body, faculty, and curriculum, having carried out a feasibility study for a world university sponsored by an international group of educators and scholars under the chairmanship of William Heard Kilpatrick. In recent years he has been in close touch with the international student movement through research and travel to lecture in universities abroad; his most recent lecture trip, in the spring of 1974, under the auspices of the State Department, involved visits to India, Malaya, Thailand, Indonesia, and Japan.

In August of 1973, Dr. Taylor organized the United States Committee for the United Nations University, a group of concerned United States citizens, including Norman Cousins, Alvin Eurich, Luther Evans, Buckminster Fuller, Richard Gardner, Margaret Mead, Seth Spaulding, and others to support the work of the UN University.

Series Editor, Donald W. Robinson

FEB 03 1976

A UNIVERSITY FOR THE WORLD: THE UNITED NATIONS PLAN

By Harold Taylor

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 74-32604
Copyright © 1975 by The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A University for the World: The United Nations Plan 7

Youth as a Social Force 10

World Unity and the International Student Movement 14

The Organization of Internationalism 18

The World Youth Assembly 23

The United Nations University 27

A University without Students 32

Some Possibilities for Action 35

The Contribution of the World Community 39

Youth Volunteers in the Human Services 43

The Creation of a Planetary Ethic 46

References 49

A UNIVERSITY FOR THE WORLD: THE UNITED NATIONS PLAN

In the streets of Bangkok on October 14th and 15th, 1973, the students of Thailand fought a pitched battle with their government and its armed forces. The government had tanks, machine guns, and tear gas. The students had no weapons except the ones they made out of bottles and gasoline or captured from the police and the army.

When the smoke cleared, sixty-six students had been killed, more than 800 wounded, the government had been overthrown, three major figures in the Thai dictatorship had been forced to leave the country, the Rector of Thammasat University in Bangkok had become Premier in a civilian government, with a new constitution promised by the end of 1974. Beginning with a student protest against the jailing of thirteen student activists, it had all taken place in ten days.

The Thai students had neither planned a revolution nor organized a revolt. They acted as so many students have been acting across the world in the 1960s and 70s, as defenders of human rights and as critics of their society and its government, upholding the mission of the university as a center for the advancement of humane values and social enlightenment.

Once the Thai activists had been jailed at the beginning, what had begun as a modest program of student support for the restoration of constitutional government developed into student demonstrations which grew in size day by day. Bus drivers skipped their regular routes to take bus-loads of students and citizens to the rallying points. By the end of a week, 30,000

students and more than 300,000 other citizens were in the streets and the government had agreed to release the prisoners.

But the struggle for the constitution had not been won, the students and citizens were still not satisfied. Small skirmishes with the police and army escalated into armed attacks by the military against unarmed crowds. Before the fighting could take on the dimensions of a civil war in Thailand, King Bhoumibol intervened, advised the premier, Field Marshal Thanom and his two chief government aides to leave the country, and appointed a new premier.

In the weeks that followed, the students, with a grant from the new government and contributions from admiring citizens, organized a program of education in democracy through which the students went into the countryside to explain the principles and practices of constitutional government. The universities returned to normal, students and faculty members cooperated with the new premier in the work of reorganizing the government and reconstructing the society. Although most of the economic, social, and political problems of Thailand still remain, the students and their universities had shown what could be done to use the resources of Thai educational institutions in the service of Thai society.

In other parts of the world, so dramatic an example of student leadership in social and political change has seldom been duplicated. The special circumstances in Thailand—the role of the king, the traditions of Thai culture and individualism, the loyalty of the military to a benevolent constitutional monarch—made this outcome of the student intervention possible.

In Greece, student protests against a repressive military dictatorship were put down by armed force, jail sentences, and further repression. In Spain, prohibitions against all organized student activity have prevented even the beginning of a national student movement. South Africa has similar controls. In South Korea and South Vietnam, authoritarian regimes propped up by American money and arms have been systematically destroying what small remnants of political freedom still exist among the students and citizens. In Czechoslovakia, student activists of all kinds were among the first to be jailed and dismissed from the universities when the Soviet Union occupied that country in 1968. For every

instance of recognition by governments of the rights and opinions of students, there are a dozen others based on an opposite response of fear, mistrust, and repression.

Yet the students and the young continue to think for themselves and to act on their own, and the student protest movement, so widely advertised in contemporary journalism as being dormant or dead, continues to spread, sometimes underground, sometimes incoherent, sometimes muted by opposition, sometimes co-opted by government manipulation, but still alive if not always well. It is the speed of change, once changes start, that is now startling.

One false move in 1974 by the Greek dictatorship in removing Makarios from office by force set in motion a chain of circumstances in which the student protests of earlier years were vindicated. The efforts of students and other citizens had helped to create political and social forces beneath the surface of Greek politics which, when the time was right, broke loose and overthrew the government.

The Greek students were among the forerunners of change, symbols of a political attitude stirring within the consciousness of Greek citizens. Over the past year in Portugal and in Ethiopia, what appeared on the surface as hopeless situations of authoritarian government changed for the better in a matter of weeks when the thrust from beneath and above reached a critical point of catalytic strength. The students were part of that strength. Everywhere in the world the consciousness of the possibility in a future world is stirring, the surface of things is seen to be no longer invulnerable, there are cracks in which new plants can grow. A student activist in Ethiopia spoke on behalf of the world student movement when he declared to his fellow students, "The basic role of the university students in this country is to make the masses more fully aware of the sufferings they are enduring passively. We may not be able to change the political structure of the society but we can certainly change the attitude of the people toward the structure."

YOUTH AS A SOCIAL FORCE

What happened in Thailand is in its own way an indication of what is happening and can happen through the initiatives of youth in the countries of the world. More than this, the Thai events were a particular case of a worldwide phenomenon which is still not clearly understood by most educational and political authorities who deal with the role of youth in their own societies. The world's schools and universities are still organized as if the potency of student motives, initiatives, and social concerns have nothing to do with their education and the future of their societies, as if the hierarchies of the traditional academic community were a form of eternal truth, as if the actions of students in demanding the right to think for themselves and to take part in the decisions which affect their lives were a threat rather than a contribution to the future of society.

In Thailand, once the repression was removed and the students and the new government joined together in dealing with the country's problems, the positive character of the student contribution expressed itself in the development of creative social projects. In the absence of repression, this has been the characteristic of student movements elsewhere, especially when the political and educational authorities treat the education of students as an enterprise in social and intellectual experience and not merely as a compulsory program of academic studies.

There are of course exceptions to that principle, in countries where student action is so closely tied to political factions, ideologies, and parties in the country at large that student politics

becomes a struggle among the factions rather than an effort for social development. The radical element in the Japanese student movement, for example, has developed into terrorist groups, some of which have put their own leaders to death for ideological deviation. The British National Union of Students at its annual conference in 1974 passed a resolution calling on its members to disrupt or prevent campus speeches by anyone known to favor rightist views.

In the case of socialist countries, the flow of student energy is directed into clearly defined channels for clearly defined social and political purposes. The question of student freedom and autonomy is answered in theory and practice by a system of social and political controls. Right-wing governments and military dictatorships exercise similar controls for different ends. Constitutional governments, liberal democracies, and democratic socialist states allow varying degrees of freedom of speech and action by students, but even here, that action is taken within a hierarchical educational system in which the governing authorities make the rules and run the institutions on behalf of pre-established social and political goals.

In large part, this is a natural consequence of the growth of world society and its institutions from the nineteenth into the twentieth century. It is a movement from an era of isolated power elites in separate nation-states through a transitional period of world politics in which nineteenth century models of political and educational institutions persist while the circumstances with which they must deal have made many of the models obsolete. Among the circumstances, the central factors are two, the interconnectedness of all the elements of the national and world society, and the radical growth in the size and importance of mass education.

Schools and universities which formerly served the interests of ruling elites through the recruitment and training of a highly selected student body have now been faced with a double demand—for an extraordinary variety of new forms of knowledge and intellectual skills for use in the society, and the provision of many new kinds of educational services for a much wider sector of each national population. In India, for example, these two demands, coming together in a relatively short period since

Indian independence, have exposed the structure and curriculum of the existing schools and universities as totally inadequate for dealing with the country's problems. The student uprisings and agitations which have plagued the country over the past ten years can be traced to that inadequacy.

It is in this setting that the role of youth in every society must now be reconsidered, in the developed as well as the developing countries. In fact, the idea of youth as a separate section of the population is itself put in question. The social and cultural needs of a given nation-state call for the mobilization of human resources in the entire population. For the mobilization to be successful, it is first necessary to adopt the simple proposition that the development of human talent is a lifetime affair, and that the education of the young and the formerly young is not something to be done once and for all in a string of years from the age of six to fourteen or sixteen.

Once that is recognized, high school and university students can also be recognized as citizens at a given stage of their lives, with varying degrees of maturity, talent, motivation, and capacity, not as "youth" or "students," to be dealt with according to rules applicable only to the immature and irresponsible. What is at stake is the integration of youth into the total society without losing the freshness and originality of the contribution the younger generation can make when the circumstances are right.

Further, the nation-states of the world are as completely interconnected as the conventional wisdom holds them to be. Therefore, the curriculum of studies and the cultural setting provided by the schools and universities around the world must no longer be built on the older nationalist lines or on the tribalisms of national prejudice. We know enough about the effects of ethnocentrism and nationalist bias in national educational systems to realize that these are major factors in creating hostilities strong enough between peoples to send them into wars against each other. We also know that although this is a situation which afflicts the present world society, it is not an unalterable fact either of education or of world affairs. Arabs receive no advantages in being taught to hate Jews, Jews to hate Arabs, Chinese to hate Russians, Turks to hate Greeks, except for the dubious advantage

of making wars between them possible, and, in the long run, necessary.

The reality of internationalism, transnationalism, and global interconnection is with us, the concept of that reality has been recognized. What is missing is the application in practice of what we already know about interconnection.

WORLD UNITY AND THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT MOVEMENT

In the case of the interconnectedness of the world's students, it is a simple matter to say, or even to tell them, that they are all interconnected. They are. They have common interests, attitudes, concerns, and needs. They have a general sense of what it means to demand and create a peaceable and just world order, and the more active among them have a very strong sense of identification with the poor and oppressed of the world.

But the hard part comes when the students or others try to build programs of international action in which the youth of the world can join together to help improve the quality of life on the planet. In the first place, students are students where they are—at home in their own countries. It is from that home base that they function as students. Whatever they learn of world problems or of changing conditions in the global society they learn from the educational and cultural experiences around them in their daily life as students. Most of the time, because of the way students are institutionalized in each country, these experiences do not give them either the information or the attitudes they need if they are to develop a sense of unity with the students and citizens in other countries or in a world culture. In many cases, students can gain little sense of unity in common interests and comradeship even with the students of their own country. The institutions and the curricula are not built to encourage that sense.

When students go abroad, it is usually to carry out a specific educational mission—to take a university degree, to prepare for

a given profession, to carry out research—and there is very little chance in the universities to which they go to enter into the experience of being part of a genuine intellectual community, international or otherwise. For most universities, the creation of such a community is considered irrelevant to the university's mission, when in fact it is a primary mission, the rest follows from there. In the United States, foreign students usually form their own national ghettos and often carry into them and spread from them the nationalist ideologies, attitudes, and preconceptions they brought from home.

American students on their own campuses have little to do with the students from other countries. With approximately 140,000 foreign students in the United States each year, the possibilities for Americans to extend their knowledge of cultures other than their own, through personal relations or cooperative studies with their fellow students from abroad, are rich and plentiful. For the most part the possibilities are never used.

Nor is there any direct connection between American student organizations and those of other countries. In 1967, when it was disclosed that the international program of the United States National Student Association was subsidized by the CIA, the American student movement received a blow from which it has not yet recovered. Not only was it impossible to find funds for international programs from other sources, but the credibility of the association as an independent body of American students was undermined, both in the United States and abroad. Since then American students, even those genuinely interested in world affairs, have lost touch with the international student movement and its organizations.

There is a deep paradox in this situation. Never before has the American student body been more conscious of the role of the United States in world affairs or more aware of world problems, from racism, poverty, and hunger to war and planetary pollution. The war in Vietnam educated an entire generation of American youth in the utter cruelty and inhumanity of war and the futility and immorality of American intervention in world affairs through the use of military force.

If Vietnam were not enough, we have the more recent educational lessons to be drawn from American intervention through

the CIA in sustaining brutal fascist regimes in Greece and Chile. The mass media have spread the word and given us the Pentagon papers, the foreign policy of Watergate, and the politics of international oil.

Yet this is also a time when an extreme parochialism affects many American students in their attitude toward world affairs and their knowledge of the lives and problems of people in other countries. They are absorbed in the American consciousness, a consciousness of America in the world, and of themselves in relation to America rather than to the world itself. The more politically inclined among them have developed a critical awareness of the nature of American policy, but their conceptions are largely negative, while the majority of students have turned to a search for a place in their own society.

This has meant that the energy injected into political and social activism in the 1960s and early 70s is now lacking in the leadership it possessed in those years, when the Peace Corps was a new invention, the protest against the war was fuelled by resistance to military conscription, the civil rights movement was a crusade for human rights, and the universities were the battleground for the opponents of the status quo in education and the social system. It is as if the American student movement, having thrown itself into the struggle for a just and democratic society, had made its gains and taken its losses, and is now in an interim period in which the Watergate phenomenon has induced cynicism among the potential activists and political lethargy among the rest.

The students are now more conscious of the enormous power of the economic, military, and political system of the United States and the world, and have become aware of the relative lack of power on their own part to effect change in the institutions—oil companies or military governments—in control of world society. What can they do about Chile, except to mourn the dead and the death of human rights, and denounce the American policies which helped to bring them about? The rallying-cry of students in other countries has been, in South Korea, in Greece, in Indonesia, in Thailand, "Down with corruption in the government." In the United States, the students have had to wait, with the rest of the population, for the remedies of the courts and of

congress to bring to life the spirit of political integrity in the world's most powerful democracy. The students see in the failure of the United Nations to settle the problems of war, of hunger, of poverty, of education, a symbolic failure of the liberal forces in contemporary history.

On the other hand, there is a movement within the established American system for reform in teaching and learning about world affairs, one which is a distinctive part of the interim period. On more than 500 campuses there are now peace studies programs of a rich variety, in which enquiring into the causes of human conflict, the nature of contemporary society, the forces working for and against a just and peaceable world order, the psychology for aggression and conciliation, and many other issues have become part of a new curriculum. Here the level of seriousness in moral and political concerns is very much deeper than it has been in the past.

There are more opportunities for American students to gain direct experience of the cultures and social systems of other countries than ever before, through field work and foreign studies developed as a regular part of American college and university programs. What is missing is a direct relation between these experiences and the organized international student movement, and a sense of unity with a worldwide student effort to improve the quality of life on the planet. The Americans simply do not know what the Greek, the Thai, the South Korean, the Indonesian, the Nigerian, the Brazilian, the South African, the Yugoslavian, or the Mexican students have done, and are doing, on behalf of human rights and social justice. They have no means of communication in the existing world networks and organizations.

THE ORGANIZATION OF INTERNATIONALISM

On the other hand, there has been in the last ten years an extraordinary growth in the number and significance of international organizations of all kinds. There are research, training, and educational programs in international affairs by the thousands in the national universities around the world. There are hundreds of international conferences each year for which research papers are prepared and discussed by international scholars, by business corporations, by government agencies. There are more than 2,300 international nongovernmental organizations in fields ranging from trade unionism and adult education to religion, the social sciences, and medicine, along with more than 250 international organizations among governments.

Yet such organizations function for the most part in isolation from each other, unconnected to the field of global action, and unconnected to the lives of youth. We find, for example, that while it is possible to pass a unanimous resolution by the world's governments for the protection of whales, the whales go on being decimated. It is possible to arrange for scholarly documentation of the torture of political prisoners, but UNESCO is unable to hold a meeting to present the evidence, while prisoners go on being tortured. The politics of the world's power structure make the scholars and students of the world dependents of governments, and human intelligence the servant of the status quo.

In the case of the students as an independent force, there are approximately forty international student organizations now in existence, some of them independent, others sponsored by gov-

ernments, several of them with branches in more than fifty countries, with coordinating staff in a central headquarters. But the problem for these organizations is to keep alive an interest in the internationalism of their programs, since the programs have to be carried out in individual countries or regions and must be specific enough and closely enough related to national and regional problems to arouse the enthusiasm and commitment of national student bodies.

Another part of the difficulty lies in the fact that students have so little authority in making educational policy in their own countries, and are so seldom asked to act as representatives of their fellow students, either in national or international affairs. Except in the Scandinavian countries where well organized student unions have direct access to the legislative bodies in which educational policy is made, there are few examples of countries in which organizations of students genuinely represent national or international student interests.

There are, of course, forms of communication among students other than the international student organizations, conferences, or the formal international studies taught in the world's schools and universities. The mass media provide a much more powerful and basic communication system, along with films, dance, music, novels, plays, poems, painting, sculpture. Ideas of the modern world and its character circulate through the world from these sources in the arts in ways which transcend the conventional systems.

No matter how often and how vigorously governments try to prevent ideas and reports of reality from travelling across national boundaries, the personal truths of the artist, the dissenter, the philosopher, the activist, the writer, the student, somehow manage to penetrate the world's collective consciousness. In the long run, ideas and truths are known by persons, not organizations. The ideas travel wherever people travel, wherever one person speaks to another, wherever books are read, films seen, poems heard.

In this sense, there is a world culture of youth, made up of a complex of parts, but with a content of its own. The students in France in the May uprising of 1968 knew about the Berkeley events of 1964, Asian and African students in the 1970s knew

about 1968 in France, Soviet youth have known about Duke Ellington for years, the young of Japan have their own version of the rock culture. The young actors, dancers, and singers in the production of *Hair* in seven countries helped to spread the philosophy of human liberation and peace in an international dimension. They also contributed part of their income to the support of the UN World Youth Assembly.

But when we return to the practical problem of mobilizing the energies of youth to take part in the decision making of the world's affairs, we find that the youth culture, while expressing attitudes to life and disagreements with the way its institutions operate, has few instruments for positive action. On the other side, the side of the power structure of world affairs, where the older generation with its institutions and social arrangements excludes youth from participation, there is a comparable lack of instruments for action.

If the youth cannot do it for themselves and their elders are not willing to reconstruct their institutions to bring in the young as participants, then we have an international impasse until we can organize some new arrangements. The most serious efforts to come to terms with the needs of youth have been made during the 1960s and 70s by the United Nations and UNESCO, and although the efforts have not been very successful as yet, the issues have been studied and some sensible recommendations made. Twenty-nine resolutions of the role of youth in world affairs were passed by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council from 1965 to 1972. The theme consisted in drawing attention to the fact that 54 percent of the world's population is under the age of twenty-five, that the present youth of the world will be responsible in the future for the support and extension of the principles of the United Nations Charter, and of the organization itself, and that the United Nations through every part of its work as an institution has the responsibility for enlisting the talents of the young.

A summary of the problems and possibilities in UN programs for youth is to be found in a major report from the Secretary-General to the General Assembly in August of 1972 entitled, *Channels of Communication with Youth and International Organizations*, and in a research report from the UN Institute for

Training and Research (UNITAR) published in the fall of 1973. The Secretary-General's report states bluntly that the basic question of what to do about youth as far as the UN is concerned requires a political decision by the General Assembly, followed by "the establishment of mechanisms capable of making the views and interests of young people actually felt. . . . Without the political decision to 'open up' the organization to young people, such opportunities, where they exist, will continue to be token opportunities only. At the same time, the political 'opening up' in itself, without specific opportunities for participation, would be purposeless. At this level, the question of communication becomes a question of participation."

Both this report and the one from UNITAR make recommendations as to how participation could become more direct. These include the appointment of a ten-member *ad hoc* Advisory Group on Youth to advise the Secretary-General, more discussion and exchange of views between the United Nations secretariat and the representatives of international student organizations in Geneva and New York, and work by youth in UN-assisted regional projects in development and other fields.

The UNITAR report is more comprehensive. It deals with the structure and problems of the international youth organizations, and points out that many of the most concerned and active youth movements around the world prefer to do their own work on issues of human rights, racial equality, education, and social development outside the organized international groups. The latter are handicapped by lack of funds and staff and few students have sufficient funds of their own to take time away from their studies for service in the student movement.

For example, there is at UN headquarters in New York a Youth Caucus composed of representatives of twenty-one international student organizations, with a convenor elected by the others to serve as administrator for the work of liaison with the secretariat and the delegations. The convenor and the other members of the caucus are volunteers, some of them with full-time jobs in addition to their program of university studies. Most of the foreign student members of the caucus are studying in the United States on scholarships and fellowships, and are perpetually pressed for funds merely to survive in the face of high

tuitions, living expenses, and the necessity of taking high grades in order to retain their subsidies. They cannot take the time necessary for serious work in the caucus, or for serious involvement with members of the UN secretariat. For the same reasons, research reports on youth, their needs, their activities, the programs they have already started or would like to start, are usually prepared by professional scholars and researchers appointed by UNITAR, UNESCO, or UN agencies rather than by the students themselves. There are no research funds, and therefore no staff. The universities around the world, which could perfectly well include research on youth problems as part of the work undergraduate or graduate students do for academic credit, are seldom willing either to suggest it or allow it.

Louis Simon, one of the most informed and sympathetic scholars in the United Nations organization on the subject of youth, speaks of the result of this situation. "Youth organizations," says Simon, "are generally critical of the existing channels of communication between youth and the United Nations and of the presumed inclination of the United Nations to treat youth as objects—to be looked after, educated and protected, and to be associated with projects and programmes that have been planned for them, rather than as an element which could have a healthy influence on the Organization. They tend to believe that the time has come for the United Nations to have a youth dimension in its thinking and operation. Generally, more channels for youth participation in the policies and programmes of the United Nations, more younger persons in the national delegations to the United Nations bodies and in the Secretariat, and greater recognition by the United Nations of the political role of youth are suggested as remedies."

THE WORLD YOUTH ASSEMBLY

There is a pervasive attitude among the more politically active of the world's students that the United Nations is a bureaucracy which operates in the interest of the existing power structures of national and international society, and that to cooperate with the organization would be a waste of time better spent in operations of their own. That attitude found its fullest expression in some of the statements made by individuals and groups at the World Youth Assembly held at the United Nations in New York in July of 1970. The assembly had been arranged as part of the twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations of the UN, with the work of planning given to representatives from thirteen international youth organizations with offices in Geneva.

It was an event of far more significance than appeared at first sight. It marked the first time in the history of the world that the world's youth had been called together to consider the situation of mankind and to express the opinions, ideas, and points of view of youth about the issues facing contemporary society. It was also the first time that the United Nations had taken this degree of initiative in relation to the youth of the world and had recognized the legitimacy of the demands of youth that the UN must take them seriously.

In the beginning, the international youth organizations were skeptical of the value of holding such a world conference at all. They questioned the motives of the UN in calling it, and inferred that it was a propaganda show to arouse interest in the UN rather than an assembly to give youth a chance to present their

views to a worldwide audience. They felt that if the United Nations officials were serious about giving youth a new role in world affairs they would make plans to involve young people in the daily operations of the UN itself, not simply turn over the UN headquarters for nine days of talking.

But once the youth organizations had formed a planning committee to do the actual work, and it was agreed that the assembly program and the policies about how to run it were to be in their hands, they became more active. They insisted that invitations should go to *all* countries, not merely to UN members, and that the participants should be selected by youth organizations in each country from a "cross-section of the organized and unorganized youth community in each country, e.g., students, young workers, rural youth, political youth, young women." It was agreed that the participants should come as individuals who represented the young people of their countries as a whole, not as representatives of specific youth groups or delegates from their governments, that they should be under the age of twenty-five, with five from each country, and an additional 126 to be invited at the discretion of the planning committee.

When the conference opened in New York there were 646 participants from 118 countries, five of them outside the United Nations. Around 35 percent of the participants were over the age of twenty-five, some of them professional youth organizers, the oldest of whom was forty-seven. Since each country was free to arrange its own representation within the assembly guide lines, there was nothing the assembly organizers could do once the over-age young people turned up except to go ahead with the program.

This was divided in fairly conventional UN style into plenary sessions and four working commissions in the areas of World Peace, World Development, Education, and Man and Environment. But there the comparison with the regular UN style stops. The meetings were much more informal, participants were identified as individuals and not by countries, there were no seating plans, very few rules of order, many of the participants spoke for themselves, not for the positions taken by their governments.

In the World Peace Commission meetings and in the report of the commission, it was clear that ideological blocs had been

formed and that some of the older and more experienced conferees had done their best to manipulate the voting in ways which would produce a final statement of support for their own governments and ideologies. Other participants resented the fact that they were not identified as to country, since they felt that, aside from a feeling of pride in speaking for their country, it was important for assembly members to know where each speaker came from and what part of the world he represented.

There were three main themes which marked the reports from the commissions and the final Message to the 25th General Assembly. Although they were not markedly different from the general views of persons concerned with world affairs and could have been written and supported by the regular UN personnel, they do indicate the point of view of the youth of the world.* The first theme was reiterated throughout, a call for unity among the youth of the world in opposition to all forms of imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism, and the need for support of the liberation struggles to achieve a just world order. This was not so much a call for peace, but for the continuation of the struggle by the oppressed against their oppressors.

The second theme had to do with the role of youth in world affairs and particularly in social development, with development defined as "a political and social process which in its highest form creates the conditions for the integral development of the individual man and of all members of the human community." In practical terms, the assembly called for support of the UN Volunteer Corps in which youth could be more widely involved, more use of domestic service programs for youth in the developing countries, and the acceptance of youth as participants in all forms and programs of beneficial social change including the regular organs of the UN, and in all efforts to protect and enhance the quality of the earth's environment.

In the third theme, in the field of education, the assembly youth wanted full participation in policy making, demanded the expansion of mass education as an instrument of social change, wanted

---

*I am indebted to Professor Donald McNemar of Dartmouth College for his comments and his analysis of the assembly in a paper prepared for UNITAR in January of 1971.

revised curricula and teaching methods, a United Nations University with student participation in the planning, and UN International Youth Centres around the world.

The hope that the World Youth Assembly would have a serious impact on UN and world thinking was not fulfilled, mainly because it was too much to expect that the youth of the world, no matter how talented, fresh, and idealistic, could put together in nine days at a general free-for-all sort of meeting, a body of knowledge or a world program, or even an exciting statement, which could raise the level of world consciousness. The most the participants could do was to provide a set of general statements which could be voted on and sent to the United Nations. To accomplish more it would have been necessary to take much more time—at least one to two years—for the planning, the selection of participants, the preparation of working papers, and the involvement of the participants in preparing themselves long before they set out for New York.

But the experiment was worth trying, if only to learn at first-hand what the problems and possibilities are in assembling the youth of the world—"the first global generation," as U Thant called them—to exchange ideas and to propose common action for a new world order. It is an unhappy fact that aside from one or two reports on the assembly (the UNITAR report is the most complete) there has been no follow-up or research on the effect of the conference on the participants or the participants' ideas for future conferences and youth programs of all kinds.

Nor is there any inclination by member-states to repeat the conference, although that was one of the major recommendations made in the conference Message to the UN General Assembly.

THE UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY

One of the problems that will persist in the future is the matter of how to get representation from the youth of the world that genuinely represents the young. The United Nations is the only organization with the capacity to bring the world's youth together on a world scale and to create an international system through which youth can join in the work of building a world community. Other conferences, for example the World Youth Festival held in East Berlin in July of 1973, attended by more than 25,000 students from 140 countries, or the Youth of the Third World Conference in Algiers in July of 1974, are supported by the funds of national governments and are intended to accomplish specific political and ideological purposes.

What is missing, in the World Youth Assembly idea and in the usual run of international student conferences, is the continuity of a worldwide effort from day to day and year to year to make it possible for the international student community to stay in touch with itself. There is no communication system through which either the participants in a Youth Assembly or in international meetings of any kind can maintain a flow of ideas and actually accumulate a body of knowledge that draws upon resources of the world's youth.

There is now an opportunity for building such a system through the United Nations University, established by vote of the General Assembly in December of 1973 and now in the beginning stage of its operation. It will not be a university in the usual sense of the word. It will have no central campus, it will accept no under-

graduate or graduate students, grant no degrees, and will consist of a worldwide network of research and training centers for dealing with key world problems.

It is an irony that a new university, planned for a new age in world cooperation and world affairs, designed to deal with the crucial issues of contemporary life, should have turned into a university without students and, in view of all the UN Assembly resolutions on youth, to have had no participation by young people in the planning. The twenty-four member governing council has no younger members, and was appointed without consultation with students, youth, or youth organizations.

The form of the university planning was dictated almost entirely by the cultural and political character of the United Nations rather than basing itself on any concept of how the world's people could best develop a world university which would serve their needs. As U Thant said in his opening address to the World Youth Assembly, "While the UN Charter speaks in the name of peoples rather than governments, mankind as such still has no direct voice in the United Nations. . . . All too often the forgotten element is man. . . . the people who live and die for the policies of political leaders they are unlikely ever to meet. . . ."

In this case, if the United Nations were to sponsor a university for the world in which teachers, students, scholars, scientists, poets, philosophers, and thinkers of all kinds were to work together to help create a new world order, it had to be done within the framework of the UN as an organization, and the UN was not organized as a center for educational planning. By a combination of efforts in UNESCO, the UN secretariat, the Economic and Social Council, and other UN agencies, U Thant's original idea, introduced to the General Assembly in the fall of 1969, underwent an evolution from the idea of a central campus with students and teachers from everywhere in the world, to a decentralized system of research institutes linked together by a coordinating staff at a world headquarters in Tokyo. The university will be financed by voluntary contributions from member governments, foundations, and individuals, with the Japanese government taking the leadership in committing $100 million to the university endowment and the full cost of constructing and maintaining the world headquarters.

In order to reach out to the university community, the UN and UNESCO planners formed two international groups of independent scholars and educators to help during the course of the planning—a Panel of Experts which worked on the design and the Founding Committee which drew up the charter. Andrew Cordier was chairman of both groups and was a major figure in the delicate work of making a design that responded to the ideals of humanitarian scholarship and the need for an enlightened conception of a world university, and could at the same time be approved by the General Assembly and gain the support of UN members and the international university community.

Until now there has been only a modest degree of interest in the university on the part of member governments, and an even more modest degree on the part of the international university community. This is partly due to the fact that so few people outside the UN secretariat and UNESCO have known anything about it, and that most of the planning was done in private sessions with very little communication of the results to the outside world. A bigger reason is that there has been a fair amount of skepticism expressed by member governments, especially in the West, as to the need for the university in the first place.

The United States has never been enthusiastic and has offered no ideas, facilities, or financial help. The Soviet Union and most of the eastern Socialist Republics opposed the university from the start and abstained from the final vote, having argued in previous sessions that there are already enough international centers, research institutes, and research projects going on in the universities, and that with UNESCO, the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), and the other UN agencies, there was no need to add anything else.

In the international response to the UN plan there has been no compelling vision of what a world university could mean in putting to work the organized intelligence of the human race to tackle the problems that afflict the planet. Certainly there is research on the major problems, sometimes prepared for international congresses, at other times carried on in national universities or in international teams. There have been major gatherings of world scholars, government officials, citizens, and scientists sponsored by the UN, in the Stockholm Environment

Conference, the World Population Conference of 1974 in Bucharest, the Law of the Sea Conference of 1974 in Caracas.

But few have realized that the ideas being generated on all these issues have never had a central breeding ground. Nor has there been a coordinated set of world institutions where the disagreements about world policy, the interpretation of opposing points of view, or the invention of new knowledge and new solutions to world problems could be dealt with in an environment of intellectual concern, free from the explicit intrusions of political ideologies and national self-interest. These intrusions are perfectly natural in the arena of a UN world conference, and they must be taken into account in any serious search for solutions to the problems. The unique characteristic of a world university lies in the freedom it can afford to the world's scholars to act on behalf of all the world's citizens, and to speculate, express themselves, report, study, and create in an atmosphere of global commitment. In the history of the world there has never been an institution like that.

The fact that it had to be created by the existing UN organization with its particular bureaucratic habits, rules, and educational attitudes was unavoidable, in the absence of any other organization capable of doing it. The universities themselves have made only feeble efforts to unite their resources on a world scale: their internationalism has been more an academic subject than a social or intellectual commitment.

There was, therefore, a privacy about the UN planning right from the start. The feasibility studies carried out by the UN and UNESCO, the latter study based on 380 replies to a questionnaire circulated to approximately 3,000 institutions around the world, were never discussed in the world academic community, with students, scholars, or anyone else, but only at meetings of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. The rationale for that procedure was that any premature announcements of the design of the university would damage the possibility of the approval of member-states, and until there was internal agreement, no external publicity would be helpful.

The selection of the members of the Panel of Experts, the Founding Committee, and the University Council was also carried out by the UN and UNESCO privately, with some consulta-

tion with governments and their associated academic organizations. There was no involvement by persons outside the inner circle. In fact, only a very few persons outside or inside the UN and governments knew anything about the work of the university planners.

Had there been time and an inclination to do so, nominations to the planning bodies and the University Council could have been the subject of a worldwide invitation, country by country, to educational organizations and universities, and the planning of the world university could have been a task to which everyone was invited to make a contribution. This would have been much more cumbersome and time consuming than the method chosen, but it would have meant that the world community would have had a chance both to know about the plans being made on its behalf and to share in making them.

A UNIVERSITY WITHOUT STUDENTS

As far as students are concerned, there is even less information about the university in their hands than in the hands of the world's faculty members. Since they have not been called upon to help in its development there is as yet no focal point around which students can rally even if they had the information. Those youth representatives in the UN Headquarters Youth Caucus who have followed the university plans have protested to the council against the absence of young people in the council. They have urged the appointment of an advisory body of youth representatives as well as representatives of youth organizations as assistants to the rector and to the directors of the research and training institutes.

Other students and educators have pointed out that the whole idea of the university is based on elitist conceptions of the relation of knowledge to the working areas of society, and that rather than breaking new ground in world education and world thought, the new institution simply perpetuates the usual academic hierarchies and cultural patterns of a system that was exposed as a failure during the educational turmoil of the 1960s. They therefore have little enthusiasm and little hope for the new institution, and consider it another UN agency in a UN system which neglects the youth of the world and is run by people whose educational thinking is already obsolete.

The reply of university proponents is that in the present stage of UN operations, granted the thinking of the older UN generation who were educated in elitist institutions and have a parental

view of the young and of students, the present structure is the only one which could have received approval in the General Assembly. They also point out that the charter as drawn is flexible enough in its provisions to allow for actions to be taken by the council and the rector to include any number of affiliated groups, including students, as part of the world system.

In other words, the United Nations has put a structure in place to be used for generating social and intellectual effort on a world scale, beginning with the efforts of scholars and scientists from the world academic establishment, to deal with the problems of human survival, war and peace, social development, and the protection of the planet. How that structure will work and who will work in it is a question to be settled by the planning of the council and the rector, and by the initiatives taken by independent scholars, students, governments, and citizens. Whatever breakthroughs there are, whatever innovations and imaginative new ways of conducting a university which is spread all over the world, will have to come from the initiatives of the world community in collaboration with the council.

As yet, the council has not been in touch with the outside world. It has been examining its own problems and working out some of the operational details and guidelines by which it will function. The charter of the university is actually drawn in a flexible enough way to allow many things to happen, but it should not be left to the council, whose members all occupy administrative posts in the world academic community, to create the initiatives all by themselves. There are no artists, poets, writers, composers, philosophers, or non-academics among them. Aside from academic administration, their fields of competence are almost entirely in the natural and social sciences, medicine and law, with two in the humanities.

The initiatives can come from almost any quarter. If, for example, the African countries which have already expressed an interest in affiliating some of their existing universities with the new institution, were to propose the establishment of a world center for educational research in an African country, this would automatically involve work with research scholars and educators from around the world on problems of social and economic development. Since one of the major purposes in founding the

university in the first place is to shift the center of gravity of world scholarship from the West toward the developing countries and to bring the talents of the international community of scholars and scientists into the areas of the world where their talents are needed, it would be difficult to avoid dealing with the actual problems of youth in the African countries. It would be equally difficult not to include students in the affiliated universities in such research, both in gathering data and in serving as respondents to questions under study.

Since the university plans call for a program of service by scholars on a short-term basis of two to three years, after which they would return to their home institutions, it is probable that those with a special interest in educational and social problems will have a good deal of autonomy in deciding what they study and how they study it, since they will have to be recruited from those who have already made substantial and original contributions to their fields. It would be perfectly natural for such persons to make alliances and to collaborate with students and scholars in the region where they will be carrying out their assignments, if only to guarantee continuity of the effort after they leave for home.

It would also be natural for them to request the appointment of UN youth internes to work with the staff, and to arrange for UN fellowships to students showing promise in a given field. A large part of the incentive for scholars to give two to three years of their careers to the UN University is likely to come from their commitment to the cause of developing a new world order and of helping to create a new world consciousness among succeeding generations. Since they will be working cooperatively with teams of international scholars from a variety of fields on research related to social action, they are likely to be more sympathetic to the idea of reaching out to the communities of the region, including the student community, than are most members of the academic profession.

SOME POSSIBILITIES FOR ACTION

But the central question remains, How can the students of the world be made an integral part of a new world institution which is designed not for students and teachers but for research scholars, and how can the rest of the world's people who are not classified as students benefit from the university as a world institution? If that question goes unanswered, there is little chance that the United Nations University will do more than perpetuate the traditions of the world academic community and circulate research reports into the hands of librarians, other researchers, and the files of international organization.

For the students of the world have already shown not only their readiness to become involved in helping to shape the future of their own society and of the world order, but have shown a form of political intelligence and social energy which has been the most important fact in the history of world education of the 1960s and 70s. The students are the living tissue which links the university to the society of which it is a part, and without them the knowledge created within the university has no way of re-creating itself within the society, no way of putting the ideas to work in the consciousness of the next generation. The failure to recognize this fact is at the heart of the failure of universities and governments to come to terms with the worldwide student revolt and to provide ways in which the student struggle for human rights and a new social order can be made a joint endeavor of the universities and the students. A world university which does not provide ways of recognizing, welcoming, and co-

operating with the world's students as partners in a new global enterprise is doomed to end up talking to itself and to the authorities of national governments. The question of what to do about students is fundamental to the university's future.

It is also crucial for the university to realize that the very definition of *student* has altered radically during the past ten years. With the wide acceptance among educational thinkers of the concept of lifelong learning rather than the division of education into formal institutional stages based on age groups, the university student of the future is likely to be of any age, from sixteen to sixty. The student is also likely to have had a varied background of preparation of study and experience in presenting himself to the universities of the world for admission to further study. It will be part of the responsibility of the UN University to discover ways in which the body of important intellectual and social experience accumulated by persons outside the regular academic institutions can be recognized as a valid starting point for higher study under university auspices.

One part of the answer to student needs goes back to the relation of the world's students to the UN itself. In the present situation, the only way a young student can have a direct relation with the United Nations is by membership in one of the youth organizations recognized by the UN. Even here his relation is quite remote, since the only persons who deal directly with the officials of the UN or any of its agencies are the members of the UN Headquarters Youth Caucus in New York or the staff and officers in the central offices in Geneva. Their dealings consist mainly of handing over statements of the position of the youth organizations on UN issues, conferring with members of the secretariat from time to time, and attending briefing sessions by UN officials given for nongovernmental organizations of all kinds. Not much of what goes on is reported back to the membership around the world, since nothing much is going on.

In the case of the United Nations University it will be possible to make a new start. The university will not be run by the UN or UNESCO; they will simply be servicing it. The university is an autonomous institution outside governments and UN bodies. Therefore, the UN Headquarters Youth Caucus would not automatically become the representatives of world youth; they are

not that, they are representatives of a comparatively small group of international youth organizations.

One good solution to the problem of representation would be to invite each member-state of the United Nations to appoint a representative to a World Youth Council, to be chosen in somewhat the way participants were chosen for the World Youth Assembly—through nongovernmental student organizations, youth groups, and university student bodies. The Youth Council could prepare materials six months in advance of a week-long world conference to discuss a youth program, and after the conference, elect a twenty-four member board as a counterpart to the University Council. This group of twenty-four with a chairman and officers, would be responsible to the 138 member-states for developing policy in consultation with the membership.

The Youth Council would meet twice a year, presumably at the same time as the University Council with whom they could spend certain intervals of time on agenda items that concerned them, with the Youth Council chairman automatically a member of the University Council and located in the world headquarters in Tokyo as the officially designated representative of world youth. The advantage of this arrangement would be that the youth of each country would have a chance to choose one of their own number to represent them, and there would be a visible link between the youth of the world and the new university.

It would mean that a young person who wished to work in the field of world affairs and world education could prepare himself to become eligible as his country's UN University representative, and there would be some targets to shoot at as far as his career and studies were concerned. There would be a career line from his studies in the school and university, or his work in a youth organization if he were not a formal student, to the possibility of becoming his country's representative. As of now, except for the UN Volunteers and their association with UN development projects in the field, there is no UN career which stands as a goal for young people to try to achieve, nor is there any place to prepare for it.

There are a good many variations and additions to the Youth Council idea, and they all rest on the principle that there should be official representation to the UN for the young people of each

country in the world. For example, each member of the University Council could organize a youth advisory group in his own country and region, and could bring to the council meetings the ideas and proposals developed by the regional groups. The council could take up the recommendation of the World Youth Assembly that UN International Youth Centres be established around the world, some of them as part of existing universities interested in the UN connection, others as direct affiliates, newly established by the UN University. This would provide a widely distributed series of international student communities at work on the problems and issues being considered by the university as a whole.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE WORLD COMMUNITY

In practical terms it seems likely that the funds for the university will be slow in coming, from the governments or elsewhere, since no one at this point is quite sure what the university program will be and governments do not want to spend their money until they know what they will get for it. In response to the Secretary-General's request of 1973 for some indication by member governments of willingness to contribute funds and facilities, the replies were fairly cautious for that reason, with only a few offering to contribute to the endowment fund, the rest offering land and in some cases buildings, most expressing an interest in affiliating existing research institutes with the university. For example, Malta proposes its International Ocean Institute, Turkey its Middle East Technical University, Israel its Institute for Desert Research, Italy its International Centre for Theoretical Physics. Other offers will be made in the future, presumably in terms of the interests and existing resources of the member countries.

This means obviously that in this beginning period most of the initiatives for establishing branches and affiliates will have to come from institutions, governments, student and citizen groups, and others who already have financial means, and that the first moves of the rector and the council will be in the direction of acting as coordinators for existing institutions and organizations interested in becoming affiliated rather than in trying to set up entirely new UN research centers in the regions of the world.

This is all to the good, as long as the council and the rector work on the assumption that their university is serving the people

of the world and not just the national governments and the international academic community. The emphasis must be on developing initiatives in the communities of the world instead of leaving it to the university planners to draw up their own program and then look for people and governments to support it.

In the United States, in the absence of government interest or leadership, this kind of initiative has already begun. The United States Committee for the United Nations University, founded by a group of concerned Americans, including Andrew Cordier, Norman Cousins, Buckminster Fuller, Margaret Mead, Glenn Olds, Harold Taylor, and others, has 250 liaison representatives on American college campuses and has organized a finance committee under the chairmanship of Warren Winstead, former president of Nova University in Florida, to raise $100 million from private sources in the United States to match the Japanese contribution to the university endowment.

A group of citizens in San Francisco has begun work on a plan to develop a UN University Center in that city, to be financed by local funds, in honor of the founding of the UN in San Francisco. For two years, the city of Toronto, Canada, has had an advisory group of citizens working with the mayor to organize a UN research center on urban problems as part of the UN University system, to be financed by municipal, provincial, and federal funds. Under the chairmanship of Glenn Olds, president of Kent State University and former Ambassador to the Economic and Social Council of the UN, plans are being made for a consortium of research institutes in the United States to work on the world energy problem in proposed collaboration with the new university.

The University of Pittsburgh has made preliminary plans for putting together three of its international programs in international affairs, social development, and education, expanding the number of students and scholars from other countries who would be included, in order to qualify as an affiliate of the UN University. A preliminary plan for a United Nations Institute at the East-West Center in Hawaii has been drawn up, with a proposal that members of the UN secretariat, newcomers as well as regular staff, would come to the institute for various periods of study of

world problems in an atmosphere free from the daily operational problems of the UN itself.

A project for the creation of a United Nations symphony orchestra has begun in New York, with plans for the inclusion of composers, writers, musicians, dancers, and actors in a worldwide effort to develop new forms of musical theater which would use the talents and resources of the world's performers and creative artists.

Naturally, all of these ideas and hundreds of others from elsewhere will have to be considered by the committee of the University Council which will be dealing with the question of the criteria of affiliation and the role of nongovernmental groups in the university. But this is the way the world community of concerned scholars, students, and citizens can become involved with the work of the new institution—by making proposals and starting programs which can, in one way or another, be related to the university. It is also the way in which the University Council can become informed and remain in touch with the thinking and educational needs of the world around them. By facing the question of who should be affiliated and under what terms, in the light of specific proposals from around the world, they will be moved away from merely theoretical considerations into the question of how to provide educational services to a world that needs them.

One of the results of the founding of the university will be that for the first time there can be a center of documentation and information on the existing intellectual resources of the world available for use in world affairs. Through a computer-based data bank, scholars and students everywhere could learn of organizations, institutions, and persons at work in the area of their own interest, and computer print-outs could supply the world with information on the present state of scholarship and research in a given field. Similarly, the distribution of research results and new ideas in all the fields of knowledge could become a major component in the work of the university, through the use of communication satellites, electronic technology, and other devices.

West Germany has already declared an interest in organizing a communications research center to deal with some of the problems of communication on a global scale and other countries

are equally interested. At present the political obstacles to free communication of information throughout an open world society are formidable, and in some cases prohibitive. If the new university is to exert a worldwide influence in carrying out the tasks to which it is committed, it will have to deal with methods and policies connected with a worldwide communications system.

As of now, even the United Nations itself with its millions of mimeographed words each year, must rely on old-fashioned means of communicating with itself and with the outside world, and has no access to the use of global-scale communication systems whose technology is already in place. No doubt that will be a major topic of research in the beginning stages of the university's work. The question to be examined is, How can the citizens of the world be brought more closely in touch with the authentic discoveries of contemporary science and human knowledge, how can the citizens come to know the actual state of the world, aside from what they are told by their own national communications media?

What is missing in the body of UN and UNESCO educational and social research already at hand is a direct connection between the ideas and analyses provided by the research and their use in educational and social action. It is as if the Bolshoi Ballet disbanded after every performance and new performers had to be found and financed to dance the works already in the repertoire. The UN University, if it shows the will and the imagination, can provide the continuity and the flow of energy between research and action. That will mean a serious decision, taken very early, to make the matter of outreach to students and citizens, cooperation with other educational institutions, and the delivery of learning services to the world community a central part of the operational plan, with an importance attached to the communication problem fully equal to that given to plans for the research and training components of the UN University regional centers.

YOUTH VOLUNTEERS IN THE HUMAN SERVICES

One of the most promising ways of involving young people in United Nations affairs and in the new university is through the programs of the United Nations Volunteers, in effect for the past three years, with 170 volunteers from thirty-two different countries now at work in twenty-nine developing countries on UN development projects, and recruitment in progress for an additional 226 posts. The 1973 projects have included economists, statisticians, agriculturalists, foresters, engineers, mechanics, veterinarians, teacher-trainers, biologists, irrigation specialists, architects, surveyors, and sociologists. Assignments are made in the field according to carefully worked out requests by governments for given kinds of manpower, and great care is taken to match the requirements of the projects with the talents of the candidates for appointment.

One of the problems faced by the administrators of the program lies in the scarcity of qualified candidates for the assignments that have been requested, especially in recruitment from the developing countries. Only 33 percent of the available posts could be filled in 1973. This is partly because few universities or educational institutions of any kind have organized educational programs to prepare young people for international service in the field of their competence, and because information about the availability of posts for international service has never been effectively circulated on a world scale.

Yet the one central idea which has appealed to the youth of the world as a means of involvement in the process of social

change has been the volunteer movement in development. Through the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service, with membership by sixty countries, and the Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service associated with UNESCO and with 110 countries, domestic and international service programs for young people have been growing year by year and have become a basic element in development planning and operation. From Indonesia to Iran to Senegal to Ghana to Thailand, youth service programs have become part of the educational and social system.

There are obviously some systematic ways in which the UN University programs of research and training in social development could be related to the goals and talents of the world's youth. The Swedish universities are at present studying ways in which they can become more completely internationalized. Suppose, as part of a new and more international Swedish curriculum, a UN educational development institute was founded with Swedish subsidy in collaboration with several Asian or African universities, the institute to be located both in Sweden and in the Third World. One part of a research and training program could concentrate on preparing young people for service as UN volunteers or as leaders of domestic service programs abroad. It is likely that students with this kind of preparation behind them in multinational teams which had already been involved in practical experience in the field would be first-rate candidates for UN international service. Those who showed special talent in action research after their tour of duty as UN volunteers could be brought directly into the UN University as internes and young scholars with special qualifications for further research and training. From there they could become valuable additions to the regular staff of UN development projects, or in other agencies of the UN, and at last a way would have been found to organize an educational program explicitly designed to bring young people into world service, into the UN secretariat, and into membership in UN delegations.

UN volunteers who had later attended the UN University for further research and training would be very well equipped not only to serve in international development projects but, for example, to help in the organization of UN University Youth Cen-

tres. Some of these centers could be formed through alliances with regional or national youth organizations, student unions, universities, and the student hostel movement. Financed with local funds, the centers could serve as recruitment stations for more UN volunteers, could conduct their own research paralleling the research program of the UN University, and could recruit young film-makers, photographers, writers, journalists, artists, television producers, to prepare tapes, films, exhibits, pamphlets, for the use of the schools, universities, and communities in putting the ideas generated in the UN University into general circulation.

Once the practical arrangements were made, students of all kinds could have a direct relation with the university—through internships, fellowships, assistantships in research, communication, and administration—the possibilities for student involvement can cover a wide range. In regions where there are United Nations University centers, research projects on the subjects and issues being studied by the scholars at the center could be carried out by students at work with their own faculty members, or United Nations studies could become part of a division of schools and universities in the region.

If, for example, a UN University project in the delivery of medical services and public health, or the study of social services and social structures were organized, students and faculty members in a given region could supply the data and parallel research results to the university, with links between the work of teams of students in one country and another. Worldwide studies of environmental problems would benefit from the contributions students could make in reporting the situations and conditions in their own countries. Similar reports could be prepared on educational experiments, educational reform, human rights, and student action for use by the UN University in assessing the state of world education and world culture. A basis would be provided in all these ways, and in many more, for directing the attention of students and faculty members toward the study of the world as a participant in its actions. A way would have been found for developing a sense that the United Nations is not a distant bureaucracy but a working place in the world community where everyone is welcome.

THE CREATION OF A PLANETARY ETHIC

What is at stake in the development of the United Nations University is nothing less than the development of a planetary ethic, and a radical transformation in the way the world looks at its own problems. The university can, if the circumstances are right, become the world's most trusted source of information, enlightenment, and ideas for global action.

The philosophy of the United Nations as expressed in its charter proclaims the unity of mankind and the necessity of creating a new world order in which there is peace and justice for all. Although the UN member nations as they act collectively or individually in the politics of the 1970s are in some ways farther away from that goal than they were at the time of the founding, this does not mean that we have reached a dead end or that we must take at face value the predictions of inevitable disaster read to us by futurists. It *is* certain that the crises announced and described—the overwhelming increase in population, the state of world food production, the threat of nuclear war, the continuing increase in armaments, the prevalence of military dictatorships, the use of war and military force to solve political disputes, the exhaustion of the planet's resources—are real and present dangers. There is a very good chance that unless steps are taken to overcome them, we will reach a point within the next century at which we will have killed, starved, or maimed a large enough percentage of the world's population to leave the rest alive in a huge armed camp under the control of those possessing the most hideous and powerful weapons.

But in the perspective of twentieth century history, it is important to remember that it is only since the second world war that there has been any widespread awareness of the interconnectedness of the global society, or that there has been any global effort to bring about a more rational, peaceful, and just world order than the one we inherited from the nineteenth century. It is also important to remember that a great many of the changes in the societies of the world and in world society itself have come about not because of international conferences but because the victims of oppression in two-thirds of the world have refused to continue to accept the conditions imposed upon them by the international colonial system. This is a lesson the Portuguese took twenty-five years longer to learn than most of the others. There are other countries still farther behind. The oppressed have been united in a common ideal of overthrowing their oppressors, and have appealed through action to the universal principle of human liberation taught by the philosophers and humanists since the beginning of the Renaissance.

We are only now emerging into a post-colonial period in which the crises which have always been lurking beneath the surface of world society are now out in the open, and the striking fact is that we now have at least enough intelligence to look at them, take them seriously, and hold world conferences about them. No matter how else it may be described, the United Nations University is an effort to mobilize the organized intelligence of the human race to solve the world's problems on a global scale, using the powers of imagination and intellect to invent new solutions and to teach a new philosophy.

Both the solutions and the philosophy can be based on the simple proposition that all forms of life on earth are interconnected in a miraculous and beautiful system and that it is the responsibility of man to use his powers to understand, cherish, and cooperate with that system. It is therefore necessary to create from the vast materials and techniques of contemporary knowledge a support system for all living things, with special attention to the sector occupied by human beings. The situation demands a transformation of thought and a rearrangement of modern institutions corresponding to the transformation of the planet into its present status as a global village.

One of the achievements of the United Nations has been that, in one way or another, it has confronted the world's power structure with the reality of the world's needs. The idea of the necessity of protecting the planetary environment from human destruction was introduced to the world through the United Nations only ten years ago. The world conference on that subject at Stockholm in 1972 was followed by direct action on a worldwide scale through the establishment of the Environment Agency in Nairobi.

The idea of a world university sponsored by the United Nations was introduced to the UN only five years ago, and can now proceed to shorten the time between the recognition of the exact character of the world's problems and the process of collective action to deal with them through the application of new forms of global self-consciousness and social strategy.

In a sense, this is part of the world energy crisis, a crisis in the use of intellectual energy for humane purposes and not for destruction or national aggrandizement. There are scholars, scientists, creative artists, students, and citizens everywhere in the world who are already part of an invisible university composed of those who wish to use their energies and talents on behalf of the human race. Some of their names are already known among the famous who have already been honored by their fellow men. They and the rest will now have a visible worldwide community to join, and to help them become known to each other in the work they do together on behalf of us all.

REFERENCES

Califano, Joseph A., Jr., *The Student Revolution—A Global Confrontation*, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1970, 90 pp.

An interpretation of student problems and attitudes toward society in ten countries of Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.

Emmerson, Donald K., editor, *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968, 444 pp.

A compilation of studies of political actions and attitudes of students in eleven countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, with reference to their influence on the educational systems and international affairs.

International Youth Organizations and the United Nations, ed. by V. Andemichael and A. J. Murdoch, UNITAR Research Report No. 17, New York: United Nations Institute for Training and Research, 1973, 95 pp.

Four papers by scholars in international affairs and the youth movement on international youth organizations and their relation to the United Nations.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, editor, *Student Politics*, New York: Basic Books, 1969, 403 pp.

Analysis of role of students in politics and higher education, with emphasis on developing countries, 15 chapters. The book is the first in a series on students throughout the world developed by the Comparative University Project at the Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.

Taylor, Harold, *The World As Teacher*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 322 pp.

The education of teachers, in world affairs, with proposals for world reform to develop a global point of view.

_____, *The United Nations University*, monograph prepared for distribution by five United States educational organizations, describing genesis of the UN University, its program, and future possibilities. Institute for World Order, 31 pp.

_____, "Strangers in the World Community," *World* Magazine, July 17, 1973.

Comment on lack of relations between American students and the international student community with suggestions for remedy.

_____, "The Idea of a World College," *Saturday Review*, November 14, 1964.

Description of a pilot project for a world college organized in 1963 with UN delegations and secretariat aid, an international faculty, student body, and curriculum.

Thant, U. "Can Scholars Succeed Where Diplomats Have Failed?" *World* Magazine, Part I, August 1, 1972; Part II, August 29, 1972.

Description of origins of the UN University, rationale for the university, narrative account of discussions among member governments, and projections of possibilities for future university programs.

World Youth Assembly, New York, July 9-17, 1970, United Nations, Message to the General Assembly, reports of the commissions, and statements of the World Youth Assembly. UN Document 56/wya/P/O of July 30, 1970, 72 pp.

Youth in the Second Development Decade: Report of the Symposium on the Participation of Youth. Geneva: United Nations, Centre for Economic and Social Information, September 27-October 7, 1972, 42 pp.

Zweig, Michael, *The Idea of a World University*, ed. by Harold Taylor, Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967, 214 pp.
A history and analysis of the idea of a world university, with descriptions of problems and proposals.

This book and others in the series are made available at low cost through the contribution of the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, established in 1966 with a bequest by George H. Reavis. The Foundation exists to promote a better understanding of the nature of the educative process and the relation of education to human welfare. It operates by subsidizing authors to write booklets and monographs in nontechnical language so that beginning teachers and the public generally may gain a better understanding of educational problems.

The Foundation exists through the generosity of George Reavis and others who have contributed. To accomplish the goals envisaged by the founder the Foundation needs to enlarge its endowment by several million dollars. Contributions to the endowment should be addressed to The Educational Foundation, Phi Delta Kappa, 8th and Union, Bloomington, Indiana 47401. The Ohio State University serves as trustee for the Educational Foundation.

You, the reader, can contribute to the improvement of educational literature by reporting your reactions to this fastback. What is the outstanding strength of this publication? The glaring weakness? What topics do you suggest for future fastbacks? Write to Director of Special Publications, PHI DELTA KAPPA, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47401.

All fifty-eight titles can be purchased for $15.00 ($13.00 for paid-up members of Phi Delta Kappa).

Any six titles $3.00 (only $2.00 for members); twelve titles $5.00 (only $4.00 for members).

Discounts for bulk orders of the same title are allowed at the rate of 10 to 25, 10%; 26 to 99, 20%; 100 to 499, 30%; 500 to 999, 40%; 1000 or more 50%. Discounts are based on a unit cost of 50¢ per copy (35¢ for members).

MONEY MUST ACCOMPANY ALL ORDERS FOR LESS THAN $5.00 OR ADD $1.00 FOR HANDLING.

The fastback titles now available are:

1. **SCHOOLS WITHOUT PROPERTY TAXES: HOPE OR ILLUSION?** by Charles Benson and Thomas A. Shannon
2. **THE BEST KEPT SECRET OF THE PAST 5,000 YEARS: WOMEN ARE READY FOR LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION.** by Elizabeth Koontz
3. **OPEN EDUCATION: PROMISE AND PROBLEMS.** by Vito Perrone
4. **PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING: WHO PROFITS MOST?** by Charles Blaschke
5. **TOO MANY TEACHERS: FACT OR FICTION?** by Herold Regier
6. **HOW SCHOOLS CAN APPLY SYSTEMS ANALYSIS.** by Joseph E. Hill
7. **BUSING: A MORAL ISSUE.** by Howard Ozmon and Sam Craver
8. **DISCIPLINE OR DISASTER?** by Emery Stoops and Joyce King-Stoops
9. **LEARNING SYSTEMS FOR THE FUTURE.** by Ron Barnes
10. **WHO SHOULD GO TO COLLEGE?** by Paul Woodring
11. **ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS IN ACTION.** by Robert C. Riordan
12. **WHAT DO STUDENTS REALLY WANT?** by Dale Baughman
13. **WHAT SHOULD THE SCHOOLS TEACH?** by Fred Wilhelms
14. **HOW TO ACHIEVE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.** by Henry Dyer
15. **NEEDED: A NEW KIND OF TEACHER.** by Elizabeth C. Wilson
16. **INFORMATION SOURCES AND SERVICES IN EDUCATION.** by Lorraine Mathies
17. **SYSTEMATIC THINKING ABOUT EDUCATION.** by Alice H. Hayden and Gerald M. Torkelson
18. **SELECTING CHILDREN'S READING.** by Claire E. Morris
19. **SEX DIFFERENCES IN LEARNING TO READ.** by Jo M. Stanchfield
20. **IS CREATIVITY TEACHABLE?** by E. Paul Torrance and J. Pansy Torrance
21. **TEACHERS AND POLITICS.** by James W. Guthrie and Patricia A. Craig
22. **THE MIDDLE SCHOOL: WHENCE? WHAT? WHITHER?** by Maurice McGlasson
23. **PUBLISH: DON'T PERISH.** by J. Wilson McKenney
24. **EDUCATION FOR A NEW SOCIETY.** by Frederic C. Mayer
25. **THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION IS OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM.** by James J. Shields, Jr.
26. **THE TEACHER AND THE DRUG SCENE.** by John Eddy
27. **THE LIVELIEST SEMINAR IN TOWN.** by John L. Parker
28. **EDUCATION FOR A GLOBAL SOCIETY.** by James Becker
29. **CAN INTELLIGENCE BE TAUGHT?** by Thomas G. Sexton and Donald R. Poling
30. **HOW TO RECOGNIZE A GOOD SCHOOL.** by Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner
31. **IN BETWEEN: THE ADOLESCENTS' STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE.** by Jerry Disque
32. **EFFECTIVE TEACHING IN THE DESEGREGATED SCHOOL.** by James H. Bash
33. **THE ART OF FOLLOWERSHIP (WHAT HAPPENED TO THE INDIANS?)** by Berlie J. Fallon
34. **LEADERS LIVE WITH CRISES.** by Theodore Kauss
35. **MARSHALLING COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP TO SUPPORT THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.** by Nolan Estes
36. **PREPARING EDUCATIONAL LEADERS: NEW CHALLENGES AND NEW PERSPECTIVES.** by Melvin P. Heller
37. **GENERAL EDUCATION: THE SEARCH FOR A RATIONALE.** by Harry S. Broudy
38. **THE HUMANE LEADER.** by Edgar Dale
39. **PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE: TOOL OF LEADERSHIP.** by King Broadrick
40. **APHORISMS ON EDUCATION.** by Raymond Muessig
41. **METRICATION, AMERICAN STYLE.** by John Izzi
42. **OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.** by Vernon Smith, Daniel Burke, and Robert Barr
43. **MOTIVATION AND LEARNING IN SCHOOL.** by Jack Frymier
44. **INFORMAL LEARNING.** by Martha King
45. **LEARNING WITHOUT A TEACHER.** by Michael Rossman
46. **VIOLENCE IN THE SCHOOLS: CAUSES AND REMEDIES.** by Michael Berger
47. **THE SCHOOL'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR SEX EDUCATION.** by Elizabeth Mooney
48. **THREE VIEWS OF COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: I THEORY.** by Joel Burdin
49. **THREE VIEWS OF COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: II UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON.** by W. Robert Houston and Howard L. Jones
50. **THREE VIEWS OF COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: III UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.** by Edgar Kelley
51. **A UNIVERSITY FOR THE WORLD: THE UNITED NATIONS PLAN.** by Harold Taylor
52. **OIKOS, THE ENVIRONMENT AND EDUCATION.** by George O'Hearn
53. **TRANSPERSONAL PSYCHOLOGY IN EDUCATION.** by Thomas Roberts and Frances Clark
54. **SIMULATION GAMES FOR THE CLASSROOM.** by Mark Heyman
55. **SCHOOL VOLUNTEERS . . . WHO NEEDS THEM?** by Charlotte Mastors
56. **EQUITY IN SCHOOL FINANCING: FULL STATE FUNDING.** by Charles Benson
57. **EQUITY IN SCHOOL FINANCING: DISTRICT POWER EQUALIZING.** by James Guthrie
58. **THE COMPUTER IN THE SCHOOL.** by Justine Baker

Order from: PHI DELTA KAPPA
Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47401

See inside back cover for prices.